

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/046,938	01/14/2002	Suresh K. Mittal	293102002103	5016
25226	7590 03/22/2004		EXAM	INER
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 755 PAGE MILL RD			MOSHER, MARY	
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		·	1648	
			DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/046,938	MITTAL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
·	Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	1648
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT! - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re on. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>4/2/2002, 1/14/2002</u> .	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for al	·	
closed in accordance with the practice un	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 24-42 is/are pending in the appli	ication.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•	
6) Claim(s) <u>24-42</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>1/14/2002, 3/6/20</u> 6	<u>02</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b) \Box	objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection t	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c	correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by t	he Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
 Certified copies of the priority docu 	ments have been received.	
2. ☐ · Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received in Ap	oplication No
Copies of the certified copies of the	e priority documents have been i	received in this National Stage
application from the International B	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not r	received.
	,	
Attachment(s)	_	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) 		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Dra	· —	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Application/Control Number: 10/046,938

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification fails to reasonably convey the concept of deleting another viral gene in addition to E1 and/or E3. The cited passage spanning pages 7-8 does vaguely refer to "one or more appropriate deletions" in a viral genome, but nowhere in the specification are any blazemarks pointing to deletion anywhere other than E1 or E3. Therefore it is concluded that these claims involve new matter.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/046,938

Art Unit: 1648

Claims 24-40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-7, 9-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,001,591. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to bovine adenovirus expression vectors with a deletion/insertion in the E1 region. Adding the recitation "replication-defective" to the claims does not make this invention distinct from the previously patented products, because E1 mutant adenoviruses are usually replication-defective.

Claims 24-40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 6, 7, 9-21, 23, 24, 26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,086,890. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to recombinant bovine adenoviruses with a deletion/insertion in the E1 region. Adding the recitation "replication-defective" to the claims does not make this invention distinct from the previously patented products, because E1 mutant adenoviruses are usually replication-defective.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and alternate F.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/046,938

Art Unit: 1648

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3/19/04

MARY E. MOSHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER